

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application, and as amended, claims 1, 12 and 21 are the independent claims. The claims have been variously amended herein to clarify the invention based on the outstanding rejections. No new matter was added. For instance, support for the amendments to claims 1, 12 and 21 whereby it is now recited that “the helper object does not cooperate with any other content viewing application” can be found in the specification at least at the following locations:

- the Summary of the Invention on page 7, wherein it states “the present invention contemplates an exemplary computing application comprising a helper object and an associated link data file” (the application comprises the helper object and it is thus not shared);
- in Fig. 3 wherein the arrows between helper object 320 and application 310 are shown as dedicated (no additional arrows to any other application); and
- on page 13, lines 21-23, wherein it states “content browser computing application relies on the interaction between browser helper object 320, browser tag engine 330 and smart tag broker 340 to incorporate and execute associated links.”
(application reliance on the helper object)

In the Official Action, dated October 5, 2004, the disclosure was objected to for an informality (corrected herein). Claims 6 and 12 were objected to for minor informalities relating to the terms “response” and “generated,” respectively (corrected herein). Claim 21 was objected to for being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of one or

more previous claims from which it depends (corrected herein by re-writing in independent form).

Claims 7-8 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Claim 7 was rejected for being in improper Markush group format. Applicants have amended claim 7 to provide additional clarity. Claim 8 was rejected for reasons relating to antecedent basis. Claims 8 and 9 were amended herein to provide clear antecedent basis for the claim elements recited therein. Claim 22 was also rejected for reasons relating to antecedent basis. The claim dependency of claim 22 has been amended herein to correct this error. Claim 23 was rejected for reasons related to indefiniteness. While not dispositive, for exemplary recent patents receiving the presumption of validity with respect to the claim format generally objected to in the Official Action, see US Patent Nos. 6,826,568 (claim 22) and 6,760,037 (claim 13). Claim 23 has been amended herein to be more consistent with the recitations of such claims. Claim 20 has been similarly amended. For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections to the above-identified claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter because they are “directed to software programs, per se, not tangibly embodied in a computer readable medium.” Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9, inter alia, are directed to various embodiments of a system for providing associated links having a help object and a recognizer. Claim 21 is directed to a method for use in connection with such a system. In any event, the invention can invariably be practiced in hardware and/or in software,

and thus Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterization of these recitations as “software programs per se.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under Section 101 is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claims 1-2, 4, 7, 10-12, 15-20 and 22 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US Publication No. 2002/0069223 A1 (Goodisman). Claims 3, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman over US Publication No. 2003/0080986 (Baird). Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman over US Patent No. 6,222,537 (Smith). Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman over US Patent No. 6,122,647 (Horowitz). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman over US Publication No. 2002/0010769 A1 (Kippenhan). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Kippenhan and further in view of Smith.

The outstanding rejections to the claims based on the art of record are respectfully traversed based on the present amendments and below remarks.

Summary of the Invention

At the time of Applicants’ filing of the present application, there were a number of limiting factors with then current schemes to incorporate and execute associated links in online content. The prior art schemes placed a heavy burden on content servers to perform significant processing when offering associated links thereby draining valuable content server resources that

may be better used to attend to additional content requests. By having the content server process associated links, there was an increase in latency between the content request and request fulfillment. The latency thus directly impacted participating users' content navigation and interaction experiences.

In consideration of such issues, Applicants' invention provides a system, and corresponding methods, for providing associated links in content viewable by a computing browser-type application capable of receiving and displaying content, comprising a helper object and a recognizer. The helper object cooperates (only) with a first content viewing application, such as a computing browsing application, to parse the content. As a non-content viewing application, the recognizer also cooperates with the helper object to compare the content with a predefined list of key-phrases and/or syntactic rules for recognizing key-phrase candidates.

Goodisman

In contrast to the invention, the linkify engine 104 of Goodisman, e.g., as described in Goodisman at [0051], "can be applied to requests using a variety of communications routes between the clients 42 and the servers 44. For example, the linkify engine 104 can intercept a request from a client 42, process the request based on the linkify methods and systems disclosed herein, and forward the linkified request to a server 44 for processing. The processed request can be returned to the client 42 via the linkify engine 104, or through another communication path that may not include the linkify engine 104. Additionally and optionally, a request from a client

42 can be submitted to a server 44, and the server 44 can thereafter transfer the processed or unprocessed request to the linkify engine 104.”

Paragraph [0053] of Goodisman further describes how the Linkify Engine 104 is a general linkify engine that can process links for all client and server requests. It states, “as FIG. 5 illustrates, the linkify engine 104 can receive a document 102 as input and can parse the document into blocks based on one or more parsing techniques 72.” It further states, “the linkify engine 104 can use a context filter 74 to determine which potential links are appropriate based on context information or data about the document 102, the user(s) who originated the document 102, *the viewers of the document 102 (and hence the linkified document 14), applications or processes in which those users may be active, the requesting device*, the requesting user's identity communicated from the initiating device), the user(s) location (communicated from the initiating device), the user(s) time of day, job function or description, security clearance, configuration or profile data associated with the user, etc.” And still further, “depending upon how the retrieved information will be presented, the linkify engine 104 can reconstruct the document 102 to include the links and the appropriate presentation of the retrieved information, thereby generating the linkified document 14.” The linkify engine 104 of Goodisman is thus extremely general and to be used by all aspects of the system, i.e., by client and server components as well as other components (See, e.g., Fig. 4 with the linkify engine 104 as the centerpiece of the architecture for communications from the various components)

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Thus, as amended, the helper object of the present invention was clarified to define that the content viewing application, such as a browser, cooperates with the helper object of the invention, such as a browser object, to parse and display links appropriately. Other independently operating applications also may have a browser object in accordance with the invention; however, such browser object would cooperate with the other independent application, not the content viewing application. In one embodiment, for instance, the content viewing application comprises the helper object and an associated link data file. (See Summary of the Invention, page 7). In this regard, the invention provides benefits not achieved by the prior art with respect to latency. The invention solves the latency problem, for instance, by achieving local cooperation on the client between the content viewing application and the helper object. Goodisman, by providing a general linkify engine located anywhere that services requests from anywhere, whether from any server machine or any client machine, has missed the point with respect to this benefit of the structure and methods of the invention. Thus, in accordance with the invention, and in contrast to Goodisman, the helper object cooperates with the browser to provide links for and display linked content, but the helper object does not cooperate with any other content viewing applications. Another helper object for the other content viewing application would be created for use with or included in such other content viewing application in accordance with the invention. The close cooperation between the content viewing application and the helper object eliminates the latency problems associated with performing such operations "from anywhere."

Accordingly, Goodisman cannot be said to teach or suggest that "a helper object, said helper object cooperating with the computing browsing application to parse the content, and

wherein the helper object does not cooperate with any other content viewing application,”

as recited in claim 1, and similarly in claims 12 and 21. Claims 2-11, 13-20 and 22-23 depend from base claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively, either directly or indirectly, and are believed allowable for the same reasons.

Baird, Smith, Horowitz and Kippenhan were cited for reasons relating to the dependent claims. The rejections based thereon relating to the dependent claim subject matter are believed moot in view of the amendments herein to independent claims 1, 12 and 21. For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections to the above-identified claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 is respectfully requested.


DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0672/158461.01
Application No.: 09/995,224
Office Action Dated: October 5, 2004

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submit that Claims 1-23 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: February 4, 2005



Thomas E. Watson
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439